

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignin 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/892,654	(	06/28/2001	Marcos de Albuquerque Contrucci	08144.0004 2029		
22852	7590	06/26/2003				
	FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 1300 I STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005				EXAMINER	
1300 I STRI					ANDREWS, MELVYN J	
WASHING	ION, DC	20005		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
				1742	11	
				DATE MAILED: 06/26/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	T	41:4(-)	<del>-/x/-</del>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	U
Advisory Action	09/892,654	CONTRUCCI ET AL.	
·	Examin r	Art Unit	V
	Melvyn J. Andrews	1742	
Th MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover shet with th	correspondence addre	ss
THE REPLY FILED 06 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of AppExamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this app (1) a timely filed amendment w	lication. A proper reply hich places the applica	/ to a tion in
PERIOD FOR F	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF T	of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See	e MPEP
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended for the shorter by above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three parned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set	the fee. The appropriate extending the final Office action; or (2)	sion fee under ) as set forth in
<ol> <li>A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 C</li> </ol>	FR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissa		
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered</li></ol>			
(a) they raise new issues that would require fur	ther consideration and/or search	n (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note			
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the applicatio issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by m	aterially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cand NOTE:	eling a corresponding number o	of finally rejected claims	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reje	ection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wou canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ld be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because:		nsidered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLEL	Y to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendme explanation of how the new or amended claims			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	rs:		
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disa	pproved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Staten	nent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	) <del></del> .	
10. ☐ Other:		MELVYN ANDREWS PRIMARY EXAMINER	ev a
			·

٠,٠٠٠



Continuation of 5.: Claim 1 has been intended to be treated as written in language falling within 35 U.S.C.112, Sixth Paragraph as such the rejection based on the combination of Legille et al, Fukushima et al, Contrucci et al and Wieczor k is considered to suggest a method of charging a different ore/coke ratio mixture in a specific pattern into a rectangular furnace, the means to do this is an quivalent of the means recited in Claim 1.Claims 7-11 have not been interpreted as within 35 U.S. C. 112, Sixth Paragraph nevertheless, the Legille et al chute as depicted in Fig 15 obviously moves in more than one plane.